The Social Principles of Jesus

By G. Bromley Oxnam

BS
670
096
1923
GTU
Storage

CROUCH MEMORIAL
LIBRARY FUND

Accession No. ----------

Date ----------

The SOCIAL PRINCIPLES *of* JESUS

By G. BROMLEY OXNAM

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

BS
670
.096
1923

0x5
LOWER
LIBRARY

This little booklet is lovingly
dedicated to
MY WIFE

BERKELEY BAPTIST DIVINITY SCHOOL
LIBRARY

Copyright 1923
By G. Bromley Oxnam

Foreword

THIS BOOKLET is published under protest. It is in no sense a scientific or scholarly treatise. Its brevity precludes complete treatment of the theme. It has been published simply to meet the demand of many friends who have wished this brief statement of the Social Principles of Jesus in handy form. These articles originally appeared in "In Days to Come" as a series on the social thought of Christ. Prior to that they had been given in fuller form as lectures before classes in the University of Southern California, Schools of Religious Education, Epworth League Institutes, and numerous general and popular gatherings. The articles were written solely for the purpose of quickening interest in the social thinking of Jesus. Many who heard the lectures have wished the outlines as a basis for further study. It is to meet that wish that these articles have been allowed to go out in booklet form.

If it be that they provoke sound thinking in these crucial hours; if they develop an understanding of the practical worth of the great ethical concepts of Jesus; if they can but

17506

suggest that the new society above all else needs the spiritual dynamic at the heart of Jesus' teachings as the cohesive force that will bind the social groupings of tomorrow into a brotherly whole; if they can aid in turning folk back to the real Christ who lived among men and gave His very life for His convictions; if they can reveal a bit of the social and individual life called for by the Social Principles of Jesus, then perhaps their publication may be justified, even though the author feels that with the thousands of publications put forth annually no one should further burden a busy reading public without having given a reasonably complete presentation of his theme.

Contents

		Page
I.	Men Not Things the Goal of Social Living	7
II.	The Solidarity of the Human Family	11
III.	The Supremacy of the Common Good	15
IV.	Equal Rights for All	22
V.	Co-operation Not Selfish Competition the Law of Progress	27
VI.	Love Not Force the Social Bond	33

The Social Principles *of* Jesus

I

MEN NOT THINGS THE GOAL OF SOCIAL LIVING

PROCLAIMING that He came to bring abundant life to men, voicing the thought that a man is worth more than a sheep, and insisting that even the Sabbath was made for man, Jesus, both in His life and teaching, announces that man is of infinite worth. He believed men were worth dying for. It is a cardinal principle of the Christ that men and not things are the goal of social living.

Serious-minded men and women must face the bothersome question, "Are we putting things first or men first?" A frank appraisal of our international, social and industrial relationships reveals the regrettable fact that a so-called Christian century is reversing the first social principle of Jesus. We are putting things first. Are we big enough to think objectively, evaluate our present order and then lay our hands to the constructive task of build-

ing a society in which men shall be put before things?

Kirby Page in his judicial article in the May Atlantic shows that "fifty thousand married workers in the employ of the United States Steel Corporation in normal times, by working twelve hours per day, six days per week and fifty-two weeks per year, can earn only $1,125—$340 less than the minimum health and decency budget. As a matter of fact the actual earnings of a large proportion of these men are much less than $1,125 per year because of lost time and unemployment." He shows further that the average family of the foreign worker has 6.63 members and in addition shows that the corporation for the years 1901 to end of 1920 on the common and preferred stock has made 13½ per cent net, and this in spite of the fact that originally more than half of the stock was "pure water." If the rate had been 7 per cent it would have made available $56,000,000 annually, which would have gone a long way toward making possible the abolition of the twelve-hour day and raising wages. Is United States Steel putting men or things first?

I remember standing upon the second floor of a factory in Soochow, China. There were

three hundred women and children working. The ages of the children ran from 6 to 10. They went to work at 5:30 in the morning and off at 6 at night—that is, twelve and a half hours a day. The temperature of that room was 90 degrees; outside it was freezing. That factory was owned by foreign capitalists from a "Christian nation." Which is it, things first or men first?

I went through a slum in Bombay. I found a thousand people living in a hundred rooms. An old woman, a leper, was taking care of tiny children there. Then I went to the places where these people worked. I found they worked twelve hours a day, their wages averaged twenty-five cents a day, and the profits of the mills were 176 per cent net the year before. It would appear that money-making was the prime consideration—life a secondary matter.

Jesus of Nazareth looks upon men as sons of God. Have we the engineering skill, the organizing genius, the technical ability to reorganize industry so as to accord with His principle? We have. It is not a question of ability. It is a question of will. We have not yet created that will that drives men to build a society in which we put men before

things. Can we banish the acquisitive instinct and supplant it by the service motive? Are we big enough to face the task and march forward to enthrone in our social life the concept of Jesus—Men and not things the goal of social living?

Professor Harry F. Ward has asked three pertinent questions in this connection: (1) What social customs and institutions today violate the sacredness of personality? (2) In what way does our industrial civilization put the production of goods above the development of personality? Is this the currently accepted ideal of life? (3) What economic rights are involved in the principle of the inestimable value of every personality? These are questions worthy of deep thought. Would it not be well to write out the answers? Is it possible to build the Kingdom of God upon foundations of economic injustice?

II

THE SOLIDARITY OF THE HUMAN FAMILY

JESUS possessed a world mind, a world heart, a world will. He commanded His followers to carry His message "into all the world" and in a memorable prayer petitions His Father that "they may be one even as we are one." Jesus thought in terms of the solidarity of the human family. Paul's Pharisaic notions are riddled by Jesus' concept of brotherhood, and the proud citizen of a Roman city comes to see that there can be "neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, male nor female, but all are one in Christ Jesus." Perhaps there is no social principle of Jesus oftener repeated and more constantly broken than His idea of the solidarity of the human family.

We break this principle internationally. Solidarity seems to stop at artificial boundary lines. Greek and Turk, Bulgarian and Serb, German and French! Do these terms suggest unity? Hardly. They suggest conflict. We live in a world of warring nationalisms in which world good is subordinate to national good. We depart company from Christ in

our present international policies and fail to see how ludicrous our petitions must appear to Him when we call upon His Father to bless our sinning.

We break this principle industrially. Seldom do we insist upon decisions being rendered in accord with Christ's insistence upon loving one another. We face an order in which personality is dwarfed, in which a commodity theory of labor is general and in which the acquisitive instinct is dominant. We witness special privilege living upon the fat of the land, while the teacher, the doctor, the preacher, the farmer, the worker often wonder how they can support and educate their little ones. Often the greater the true service the lesser the actual reward. The profiteer calls for one hundred per cent Americanism. The parasite cries for the protection of the *status quo.* One hundred and five times railroads break the decision of the Railway Labor Board and no action is successfully taken. The railway men rebel when the board's decisions violate the transportation act, tear down life protection built up in a generation of advance, and order 199,771 Maintenance of Way men to work for $65 a month. Then the Attorney-General secures an injunction to curb

them. Now, I am not placing blame. I am simply trying to point out that industrially we are not practicing the thought of Jesus.

We break His thought racially. Witness the race conflicts of the world. The lynching of negroes in the South is evidence in point. Bessie Beatty, in reviewing her experiences in Russia, said, "Oh, yes; Russia is quite well informed about about American atrocities in the South." The race problem is worldwide at this moment and many believe it the most critical problem of the century.

We depart company from Jesus, then, internationally, industrially and racially. Why? Because with all our marvelous advance—the conquering of the air, the annihilation of space, the steady march toward victory over disease, the building of the machine—with it all we have not yet mastered the problem of living together. It is tragic to contemplate that the genius of man has wrought such marvels, but seemingly has not been able to build a world in which men may live together as brothers, has not been able to produce the spirit that holds men each to the other as comrades. The supreme problem of our day, expressed in various ways, is nothing more nor less than learning how to live together in

peace, justice and love.

In a word, Jesus thought of men as brothers, the children of a loving Father. He would have us one. As yet we have not achieved brotherhood internationally, industrially or racially. When I hear men refer to the effiminacy of the Christian message, its lack of challenge, I wonder if they know the boldness of its hope. It would have nothing less than a new world. Has not the time come to cease bristling up when the present order is attacked? Has not the time come to saturate our minds in the thought of Christ? Has not the time come to evaluate our order by His standards of value? Has not the hour arrived to make His thought regnant among men? Why not toss aside the coat of mail, cease defending violations of the Christ way of life and use our strength to build an order in which brotherhood may be expressed based upon the concept of the solidarity of the human family?

III

THE SUPREMACY OF THE COMMON GOOD

JESUS was born in a stable. His parents were lowly folk. His mother dreamed that her Son would have a part in scattering the proud in the imagination of their hearts, in putting down the mighty from their seats and exalting them of low degree. He refused special privilege in the hour of His temptation. He declared in His first sermon that He was anointed to preach the gospel to the poor, to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives and recovery of sight to the blind, to set at liberty the bruised. Throughout His life He was interested in the weightier matters of the law. He knew men could not serve God and Mammon. Is it any wonder the common people heard Him gladly? Jesus insists upon the supremacy of the common good.

It would appear that twentieth-century followers of Jesus dare do no less than did He. The common good must be put first. It becomes incumbent upon the individual Christian, and likewise upon the united forces of Christendom, both individually and collec-

tively, to insist upon the practice of this principle. The abstract statement, however, is valueless unless the Christian knows the forces attacking the common good. The temple must be cleansed, but it is necessary to know who makes it a den of thieves. The thieves must be driven out. Jesus harbored no ill-will toward the money-changers as persons, but He was relentless in banishing exploitation from His Father's house. So, too, as we consider the forces undermining the common good we must harbor no ill-will toward the offender as a person, even though we have to drive him from the body-politic.

There are many cancerous growths in the American Commonwealth slowly destroying the common life. But three of them can be presented in the limits of this article.

(1) The Private Control of Natural Resources and Public Necessities

America is rich in God-given wealth. She possesses coal, iron, forests, fertile lands, water-power, untold riches. We have witnessed the passing of this wealth, which no man made but was given by God, into the hands of a very few men. Upon the basis of

natural resources monopolies were built up and, with resultant wealth, special privilege was sought through bribery, influence and power at the hands of our political institutions. Private control of natural resources has made a few immensely wealthy, has given them a throttle hold upon the lives of millions, has caused much political corruption. It has developed class privilege among the wealthy on the one hand and class consciousness among the workers on the other. It is a destructive force in the Temple of the Commond Good. It must go. Private control of public necessities has likewise resulted in evil doing and injustice. People must drink water, travel upon street-cars, must secure many other human needs. These needs are capitalized, and private control of necessities does not become a democracy.

(2) The Control of Credit Vested in the Hands of a Few

If it be unwise for a few to hold political power, if political autocracy be a menace to the common good, then is it not equally dangerous for a few men to hold the purse-strings of a nation through that creation of

modern day—credit? Every American should read and carefully ponder Louis D. Brandeis's "Other People's Money and How the Bankers Use It." Coming from one who is now a justice of the Supreme Court, the words carry additional weight. One quotation may serve to indicate the sinister influence of credit control. He says:

"J. P. Morgan (or a partner), a director of the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad, causes that company to sell to J. P. Morgan & Co. an issue of bonds. J. P. Morgan & Co. borrow the money with which to pay for the bonds from the Guaranty Trust Company, of which Mr. Morgan (or a partner) is a director. J. P. Morgan & Co. sell the bonds to the Penn Mutual Life Insurance Company, of which Mr. Morgan (or a partner) is a director. The New Haven spends the proceeds of the bonds in purchasing steel rails from the United States Steel Corporation, of which Mr. Morgan (or a partner) is a director. The United States Steel Corporation spends the proceeds of the rails in purchasing electrical supplies from the General Electric Company, of which Mr. Morgan (or a partner) is a director. The General Electris Company sells supplies to the Western

Union Telegraph Company, a subsidiary of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company, and in both Mr. Morgan (or a partner) is a director. The Telegraph Company has an exclusive wire contract with the Reading, of which Mr. Morgan (or a partner) is a director. The Pullman Company buys (for local use) locomotives from the Baldwin Locomotive Company, of which Mr. Morgan (or a partner) is a director. The Reading, the General Electric, the Steel Corporation and the New Haven, like the Pullman, buy locomotives from the Baldwin Company. The Steel Corporation, the Telephone Company, the New Haven, the Reading, the Pullman and the Baldwin Companies, like the Western Union, buy electrical supplies from the General Electric. The Baldwin, the Pullman, the Reading, the Telephone, the Telegraph and the General Electric Companies, like the New Haven, buy steel products from the Steel Corporation. Each and every one of the companies last named markets its securities through J. P. Morgan & Co., each deposits its funds with J. P. Morgan & Co., and with these funds of each the firm enters upon further operations."

(3) The Plutocratic Control of the Press

In a democracy the masses of the people are dependent upon the press for the information upon which they form their social judgments, which they later express at the ballot-box. A doctor who would poison a city's water supply in order to have sick to exploit would meet the ready fury of his towns-folk. But the press poisons the mind of the populace and is rewarded by big circulation and heavy advertising. Here, again, the American who is interested in this social concept of Christ should read Walter Lippman's "Public Opinion" and Upton Sinclair's "Brass Check." Walter Sherman of San Francisco says: "In olden days we paid the scavenger to cart away garbage from our back doors. Nowadays we pay the newspaper to throw it in our front doors." Propaganda, falsified industrial news, inadequate industrial reports, full-page exploitation of divorce scandals, crimes and sex problems! No wonder foreign friends refuse to use the word "journalism" to describe the American press. Its falsities are largely due to the plutocratic control which puts money making before the truth.

The problem of industrial autocracy, the control of the machine, the question of world markets, economic imperialism and many others must be faced under this principle of Jesus.

It must be seen clearly in this connection that we are facing the property issue throughout. Time was when men had absolute control of men and with the resultant power lived in special privilege. The same control was once exercised over the institution of religion. Later the state was controlled by a few, who through power ruled and the common folk were well-nigh forgotten. We now face the new problem of property controlled for power, when, in truth, it should be owned for use.

This principle is bothersome. It forces the Christian to face great odds. It calls for a cross. Jesus accepted it. He put the common good first and was crucified; but from His death has come the motivating force that has sent thousands forth to battle against slavery, religious and political autocracy and will yet send forth warriors who will carry on until every power attacking the common good is vanquished and the good of all has been made supreme.

IV

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR ALL

JESUS uses the word "whosoever." It is a big word. He did not say "Ye educated, come unto me." Nor did he say "Ye illiterate, follow me." He used an all-inclusive term. In His conversation with Nicodemus He declares that God loved the world, not sections of it. In the Sermon on the Mount He speaks of a Father who makes the sun to shine upon the unjust as well as the just. It would appear that one so interested in all His brothers, who insisted that we were children of one Father, who would share the "living water" of His truth with the Samaritan, who urged His followers to go into all the world and preach to every creature, would stand in His thought life for the principle He lived in His daily life, namely, Equal Rights for All.

There are some people who shy at the word "equal." They picture a fifth Horseman of the Apocalypse going about clad in red, scissors in hand cutting everything up into equal parts and dividing the parts equally among all the people. Of course no person who has studied entertains nor advocates such non-

sense. What is meant here is simply putting a foundation of equal opportunity beneath all the people of the race, then allowing them to grow as tall as they please in the development of their personalities, provided they do not injure their brothers in growing. There are many rights to be considered under this principle of Equal Rights for All. Only a few can be presented here.

The Right to Be Well Born

Is there anyone who has pictured Jesus holding the little children close and declaring "of such is the Kingdom of Heaven" who would deny the right of every babe to be well born? But what are the facts? In Ahmenabad, India, in 1912, 866 out of every 1,000 babies born were dead at the end of the first year, while in New Zealand the death of a babe before the first year of age is reached is considered well-nigh a sin. In Los Angeles the Mexican babe has just one-third the chance to live the white babe has. There are causes behind such facts. They must be brought to light and banished. I am concerned here simply with statement of principle. Is not the hour at hand when folk professing to bear the name of Christian should rise and guarantee

to all the right to be well born so far as it is scientifically possible?

The Right to a Home

It is in the home that the little ones first learn the lessons of true democracy in mutual sacrifice, mutual joy, mutual love, mutual service. Here, too, may be developed the finer sensibilities—the love of beauty, the sweetness of modesty, the love of God at mother's knee. But what of homes? I went into a little room in Los Angeles on Christmas Day and found eight people living there. I have seen eleven crowded into a tiny room in the slums of Tokio. The tragic stories of New York tenements are well known. What causes this? How many can speak with facts to back general statements regarding conditions of this kind? More than ten per cent of the habitations of England are listed as overcrowded by the British census. That means there must be an average of more than two people to a room according to the British method of enumeration. In other words, a four-room house must have nine people living in it to be listed as overcrowded. What chance for modesty? What chance for beauty? What chance for life? Jesus insists upon equal opportunities.

The Right to Play

I have seen little children whose ages ran from six to ten standing in front of the machine throughout a twelve-and-one-half-hour shift, and I have seen little tots dancing around the Maypole in our Los Angeles playgrounds. Jesus says "Equal rights." The relation of play to growth, to juvenile delinquency, to democracy should be studied by twentieth-century followers of Christ. A delinquent youngster came to me one day. His nickname was "Shrimp." He said: "Gee, I got pinched again. They took me in jest for hooking a lawn-mower. Now, what d'ye think of that?" It was a social attitude born upon the streets. Supervised play was his right. Through it he would have developed a different social attitude, but his right had been denied him.

The Right to an Education

How many would sell the ability to appreciate a poem, to understand a great play, to glory in the sweet message of music, to look upon the world and know its truth, its goodness, its beauty? A million dollars could not force one to exchange his mind for the mind of "The Man With the Hoe." Surely "the glory of the lighted mind," so precious to

those who have received the privileges of education, is something too precious to keep for a few. The right to an education must be included here.

The Right to Work

Enforced unemployment in the lands of the earth! Men struggling on the docks of London, literally striking down their fellows, to get work! It would seem the Master speaks: "To the holy task of so reordering your life that all may have the right of self-maintenance."

The right to vote, the right to a voice in industry, the right to leisure, the right to legal justice, the right to know God! Think them through. There are many rights. And I do not forget duties. The insistence upon rights is to bring a heavier insistence upon duty, to be considered in a later article. For the present consider the implications of the concept of Jesus, Equal Rights for All, remembering the while that the churches officially have declared for "Equal rights and complete justice for all men in all stations of life."

V

CO-OPERATION AND NOT SELFISH COMPETITION IS THE LAW OF PROGRESS

In the thought of Jesus true progress is based upon co-operation, not upon selfish competition. His conception of progress seems to be at variance with the oft-repeated statement of the older economics that "competition is the life of trade" and the common notion of popular biology that "self-preservation is the first law of life." That Jesus insisted upon the co-operative principle as essential to progress is clear to any student of His thought. The Golden Rule He advocated, the great prayer wherein He would have our trespasses forgiven even as we forgive others, and His presentation of a new greatness which is dependent upon service and sacrifice, together with a score of references, bear out this contention. Nietzsche recognized this element in Christian thought and ridiculed it, declaring that Christianity makes for "the survival of the unfit." Of course he misconceived the purpose of Christianity here, since its goal is really the removal of the causes of unfitness, thus elevating the entire race. Recent books,

such as "The Church and Industrial Reconstruction," take a position in harmony with the thought of Jesus. This book attempts a definition of an ideal social order. The first phrase in the definition is "It would be a co-operative social order." Are the thinkers of twentieth-century Christianity, the men of social thought throughout the world who insist upon a co-operative social order, and the Christ Himself building upon a false hope? What about "nature red in tooth and claw," "the struggle for existence, "competition the life trade"? If these be laws in fact we must abide by them; but are they?

The Doctrine of Mutual Aid

Two books, among a growing literature, reveal how grossly the "social Darwinists" have misrepresented Darwin himself, who declared that these folk insisting upon "the survival of the fittest" were incorrectly interpreting both his hypothesis and his evidence. These books are George W. Nasmyth's "Social Progress and the Darwinian Theory" and Prince Kropotkin's "Mutual Aid." The contention of these books is summed up as follows:

"The struggle in nature is a struggle between individuals and not an organized conflict between species. Also it is mainly a conflict between individuals of different species for individual purposes, which is not proved to eliminate or even weaken any other species. There is no such thing in nature as the organized warfare of one nation against another nation, both of the same species. . . . The main struggle in the animal world is for food, and while this may lead to a conflict between individuals of the same species, yet usually when one animal suffers in the necessary struggle for food he usually suffers at the hands of an animal of another species altogether.

"Also the struggle for food in the animal world is not mainly a struggle between animals, but a struggle against nature, an endeavor to overcome the environment of nature in so far as it is hostile. This is a mutual necessity, in the course of which, it is pointed out, co-operation develops as well as struggle. First the sexes co-operate and then organized bands of animals in providing food for the young and in the care of the weak. In that mutual interest of overcoming nature organized co-operation increasingly develops, and the individual who finally has the best chance

to survive is not necessarily the best fighter, but the one who is protected by the most co-operative group. In the same way the surviving species is that which is able to develop the greatest degree of co-operation in the attack on nature.

"Therefore it is concluded that the dominant factor in the animal world is mutual aid, that it is the law of progress, and that the development of society is the increase of the capacity for co-operation. So it is only a part of the truth to say that self-preservation is the first law of nature. Service and sacrifice also are primal instincts of humanity, with an ancient lineage in the animal world."

Competition Before the Bar of Fact

The term "Selfish competition" has been used for the purpose of differentiating between the so-called form of competition, which has been termed "friendly rivalry in mutual service" seen when doctors compete in ascertaining the causes of a dread disease, and real competition in which the spoils belong to the strong. Using competition in the latter sense and forcing it before the bar of fact, it will be seen that the competition of the nations of the world in their imperialistic sinning has brought

the world into conflict and cost it millions of lives, incalculable wealth, much idealism. Competition has spread from the individual struggle to group struggle, and at the moment classes struggle for the product of industry. That struggle is freighted with danger and threatens the very work life of man. The terrible wastes of competition are evident to all who watch the senseless duplication of railway service in some areas and the lack of reasonable service in others. It is seen in the deplorable situation in the coal industry, where men have gouged the mines of the richest coal, leaving behind millions of tons of usable coal which could have been mined under a co-operative plan. The partial ruination of our forests, calling forth the campaign for "conservation" under Roosevelt and Pinchot, shows what competition does to natural resources, proceeding as it does without regard for the morrow. Big business faced and recognized that ruthless competition meant death. Then came the trust and combine to thwart its sinister effects. A frank study of competition as a law of progress reveals that modern industry has come well-night to a standstill. Workmen are not producing as heretofore and will not in the competitive order. Some other

principle must be put at the center of industry to lead us out.

There is much evidence to support the contention that co-operation is the law of progress. Witness the advances of co-operation in England and other European lands. The co-operatives of England are supplying nearly one-third the people of Britain with the necessities of life. Co-operation in Church work furthers the Kingdom. Space does not permit a discussion of this question. The statements presented above are but to suggest lines of thought to be pursued in thorough treatises. Interested readers are referred to Harry F. Ward's "The New Social Order," Chapter III, Universal Service.

VI

LOVE AND NOT FORCE IS THE SOCIAL BOND

"This is My commandment that ye love one another as I have loved you. Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends." That is the teaching at the very center of Christianity and forms the base for the statement that love and not force is the social bond. Jesus went so far as to ask us to love our enemies. He defined religion in terms of love for God and love for brother. He relied upon love to unite men in fellowship. He insisted that they who take the sword perish by it. It was love that prompted the Father of all to send Christ as His Revealor to men. Love is the ruling idea of the great parables of the Prodigal Son and the Good Samaritan. It is the motif of the Last Supper. It is the decisive force in the Garden, the ruling passion of the Cross.

Love is not relied upon to unite us internationally. We build gigantic navies and powerful armies. We rely upon physical force to build the new world. In the name of the Prince of Peace we justify war. We build up

great organizations in the industrial world to be sure we get all we can from the work process, and we base the organizations finally upon force. It is said love is a foolish abstraction, good for preachers to prate about, but business is not a trysting place. "Love spells ruin."

But the advocate of force is hard pressed these days. In world affairs his success is measured by cross-fields, increased hatreds, frightful suspicions, a civilization upon the verge of ruin. In industry the policy of force has resulted in disruption, misunderstanding, loss of production and the development of intense class spirit upon both sides. Dynasties builded upon force are falling or have fallen. The Czars of Russia rule no more; the Hohenzollerns have gone; the Hapsburgs are wellnigh forgotten. Force does not hold men together. It is not the social bond.

Jesus saw clearly that love is the social bond. He preached it and He lived it. He loved people. He loved those who despitefully used Him. But there are folk who say there is no such thing as love and that everyone is motivated by selfishness and you are building upon the sand when you insist upon love as the social band and the cohesive force

that holds us together. People talk about enlightened selfishness. However, facts are better than statements of opinion. Let any man hold his own babe close to his heart and deny the fact of love. Explain the sacrifice of noble souls upon any other basis than love. Witness a mother shield her child and give her very life for the little one and then deny love. Love is one of the most evident of experiental facts. It is upon this force that Jesus relied to hold the social group together. Will it work? Witness its transforming power in the realm of prison reform. Witness its influence in the mission field. Witness its effect upon the child in modern education.

Thomas Mott Osborne tells us that there were seventy-five prisoners and eighty-one guards when he took charge of the Portsmouth Naval Penitentiary. He said he discharged the guards, treated the men as men and trusted them. During the war 3,500 prisoners passed through his keeping. Never a one attempted to escape. At the close of the war there were 2,500 prisoners at Portsmouth and not a guard. Louis Etyinge, a lifer at Florence Penitentiary, was changed because a little old woman stooped and kissed him upon the brow, telling him she believed he could

become a man if he would. "When we treat the living thief as He treated the dying thief we get His results." The practice of goodwill in industrial establishments has proven the efficacy of the principle. The love manifested by the Quakers and the Student Relief in Germany and Austria has done more to build foundations for lasting peace than all the guns of France's mighty army.

Our modern playwrights are catching a vision of the power of love, and Kennedy writes his "Terrible Meek," Pollock pens "The Fool," and Katrina Trask reveals the hideousness of force in her Nobel Prize work called "In the Vanguard."

The hour is at hand when the followers of Jesus must cease reliance upon physical force to build the better world and recall the Lord's statement, "This is my commandment that ye love one another." Our social life must be rebased. Its central principle must be changed. Love must become regnant. It must be seen that love can only be enthroned by love. Some people would whip a man into the kingdom and then love him. The kingdom comes through love.

"Ye have heard that it hath been said, Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy.

But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you and pray for them which despitefully use you and persecute you that ye may be the children of your Father which is in Heaven." It is not only that we may be children of the Father that we must love one another, but it is that society itself may be held together. Reliance upon physical force leads us to world suicide. Love and not force is the social bond.

SUGGESTED BOOKS FOR THE READER INTERESTED IN THE SOCIAL PRINCIPLES OF JESUS

1. The Social Principles of Jesus
   Walter Rauschenbusch
2. Christianizing the Social Order
   Walter Rauschenbusch
3. The New Social Order
   Harry F. Ward
4. The Gospel for a Working World
   Harry F. Ward
5. Social Evangelism
   Harry F. Ward
6. The Church and Industrial Reconstruction
   By the Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook
7. The Reconstruction of Religion
   Charles A. Ellwood
8. The Acquisitive Society
   R. H. Tawney
9. Christianity and Economic Problems
   Kirby Page Editor
10. Facing the Crisis
    Sherwood Eddy
11. Property
    Bishop Gore and Others
12. Sociological Study of the Bible
    Louis Wallis
13. Social Teachings of the Prophets and Jesus
    Charles F. Kent
14. A History of Social Thought
    Emory S. Bogardus

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500

All items are subject to recall.

SPANISH-AMERICAN
INSTITUTE PRESS
GARDENA - CALIF.

GTU Library
3 2400 00589 1233

LIBRA[illegible]

1. **No book may be [illegible] without being charged to the borrower.** Borrowers are responsible for any damage done to the volumes while in their possession and are expected to make good all losses.
2. (a) **Reserve Books** may be borrowed for a period of two hours. In case no call has been made in the interval, books may be renewed for a second two hours. (Where there is only one copy, book must be used in the library.)

   (b) Reserve books taken at 10 p. m. Mondays to Fridays are due at 9 a. m. the next morning. A reserve book taken from the library at 12 m. Saturday is due at 9 a. m. the following Monday.
3. Books not on reserve may be drawn from the library for two weeks and may be renewed once for the same period, except one-day books.
4. A fine of two cents a day will be charged on each book which is not returned according to the above rule.
5. **MAGAZINES ARE NOT** to be taken from the library without the special permission of the librarian.

FX19
0x5
17506